REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 5, 6 and 14 are objected to and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-4, 7-13 and 15-22 are rejected. Claims 5, 6, 8, 10, 14, 19 and 20 have been amended. Claim 11 has been cancelled. New claims 23-26 have been added. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 and 12-26 is requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5, 6 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 5, 6 and 14 have been amended to include all of the limitations of the base claim. Applicant believes that claims 5, 6 and 14 are now in a condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 8-13 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Subbiah et al. US 6,366,961.

Subbiah fails to teach each and every element of claim 1. Subbiah fails to teach at least the element of header-formatted headers for the multiple datagrams.

It was alleged in a September 13, 2005 Office Action that the MINI-IP packets of Subbiah are header-formatted headers. However, the MINI-IP headers are not header-formatted. Referring to figure 3, the MINI-IP headers are created by negotiating a channel identifier field (CID), a length identifier (LI), a sequence number (SN), a transition bit (T) and a reserved bit (X). Since several users share a same RTP connection, CID bits are allocated to identify different users. The values of the CID bits are negotiated and assigned during setup. See col. 5, lines 22-29. The values of the remaining fields are similarly negotiated and assigned. See col. 5, line 30, *et seq*. Since Subbiah does not disclose formatting or changing the IP/UDP/RTP header in any way (see figure 3), in order to save bandwidth Subbiah is disadvantageously limited to grouping users sharing a same IP/UDP/RTP header (see col. 5, lines 5-21.)

In contrast, the compressed headers of claim 1 are header-formatted. Referring to figure 5 of the present application, it is shown that compressing headers IP1, UDP1 and RTP1 formats the header T1. Since header T1 is formatted by compressing headers, header T1 is a compressed header-formatted header. See page 13, lines 9-21. One advantage of header T1 being header-formatted is that bandwidth may be saved by not including an entire

unchanged and uncompressed IP/UDP/RTP header within a tunnel packet. Thus, claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 2-4 and 7 are dependant and should also be allowed. New claim 25 has been added.

Claim 8 has been amended. Support may be found in figure 5 of the present specification. Subbiah fails to teach at least the elements of a wherein the corresponding headers are formatted by compressing voice data headers and should be allowed for at least a similar reason as claim 1. Claim 9 is dependant and should also be allowed.

Claim 10 has been amended. Support for the amendment may be found in Internet Draft draft-ietf-avt-tcrtp-00.txt (see introduction) that is incorporated by reference into the present specification on page 12, lines 6-7. Subbiah fails to teach the element of a tunneler to datagram-encapsulate an outbound tunnel packet payload into a tunnel datagram using a layer two tunneling protocol.

It was alleged that the IP/UDP/RTP header shown in figure 3 constitutes a tunnel header. One of ordinary skill in the art would not refer to an IP/UDP/RTP header as a tunnel header; however, claim 10 has been amended to include a tunneler using a layer two tunnel protocol. Subbiah fails to disclose or suggest a tunneler using a layer two tunneling protocol to encapsulate a tunnel payload. Thus, claim 10 should be allowed. Claim 11 has been cancelled. Claims 12-13 and 15-18 are dependant and should also be allowed.

Claim 19 has been amended. Support may be found in the present specification page 12, lines 11-24 and page 18, lines 2-6. Subbiah does not teach a means for generating a tunnel header for encapsulating the outbound tunnel packet payload.

During a September 27, 2005 phone meeting the Examiner alleged that the IP/UDP/RTP header shown in figure 3 of Subbiah was a tunnel header. Even if the IP/UDP/RTP header were a tunnel header (which it is not), Subbiah does not disclose a switch receiving an inbound tunnel packet payload and *generating* a tunnel header. Subbiah relies on maintaining the IP/UDP/RTP header between all hops and nodes. When a packet with an IP/UDP/RTP header and several MINI-IP headers is received at a node, the node reassembles only the RTP payload before transmission to the next hop. See figure 6. The node does not generate an IP/UDP/RTP header, but instead uses the received IP/UDP/RTP header. *Id.* Thus, Subbiah fails to teach a means for generating a tunnel header as claimed. Thus claim 19 should be allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subbiah et al. in view of Westberg US 6,041,054.

Claim 7 should be allowed for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subbiah et al.

Claim 20 has been amended. Support for the amendment may be found on page 13, lines 10-20. Subbiah fails to teach each and every element of claim 1. Subbiah fails to teach at least the element of wherein the compressed-formatted headers are formed by compressing voice data headers and may be decompressed to form decompressed headers.

The MINI-IP headers disclosed in Subbiah are not formed by compressing voice data headers and may not be decompressed to form decompressed headers. For example, referring to figure 3, the header IP/UDP/RTP is never compressed in Subbiah. The MINI-IP headers include the channel identifier field (CID), the length identifier (LI), the sequence number (SN), the transition bit (T) and the reserved bit (X). All of this information is used to reassemble mini packets into a payload of voice data behind the original and uncompressed voice data header. The information is negotiated and assigned and not formed by compressing headers nor is it capable of being decompressed to form a decompressed header. Since Subbiah does not disclose compressing voice data headers, in order to save bandwidth Subbiah is disadvantageously limited to grouping users sharing a same RTP/IP/UDP connection (see col. 5, lines 5-21.)

In contrast, claim 20 includes the feature wherein the compressed-formatted headers are formed by compressing voice data headers and may be decompressed to form decompressed headers. Referring to figure 5 of the present specification, construction of compressed-formatted headers is shown. "Block 88 compresses IP1, UDP1 and RTP1 of datagram 80 to a TCRTP header T1..." See page 13, lines 10-20. Thus claim 20 should be allowed. Claims 21 and 22 are dependant and should also be allowed.

New claims

New claims 23 and 24 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in Internet Draft draft-ietf-avt-tcrtp-00.txt (see introduction) that is incorporated by reference into the present specification on page 12, lines 6-7.

New claims 25-26 has been added. Support for the new claims can be found in figure 5 of the present specification.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 and 12-26 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Michael A. Cofield
Reg. No. 54,630

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613

Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number571-273-8300. on October 3, 2005.

Signature

Deanna Brusco

Deanna Brusco